

CITY OF ANGELS
PLANNING COMMISSION
SUMMARY MINUTES

**Meeting of Thursday January 13, 2011
City Fire House 1404 Vallecito Road
Angels Camp, California**

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Gary Croletto at 6:02 P.M.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Chair Croletto, Commissioner Rowe, and Commissioner Reesman

Commissioner Absent: Vice-Chair Griffin, and Commissioner Cullick

Staff Present: Director of Planning & Building David Hanham, Deputy City Clerk Jennifer Preston

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Approval of the December 8, 2010 Planning Commission Minutes.

Page 1, in title, "Meeting of Wednesday November 8, 2010" should be "Meeting of Wednesday December 8, 2010".

Page 1, Approval of Minutes, last comment needs to be separated by "**General Comments**".

Page 2, change throughout the minutes, statements need to be in 3rd person.

Page 2, 1st paragraph under public comment, "Mr. Hoag stated that is it" and it should be "Mr. Hoag stated that it is".

Page 3, 3rd paragraph, 3rd line down, "with in" should be "within". 7 lines down, "then cause" should be "then causes". 10 lines down, "all add into" should be "all affects".

Page 3, 4th paragraph, states "that is not in" and it should be "that is not allowed in", and "you will get the variance" and it should be "you will automatically get the variance".

Page 6, Item 3, 1st paragraph, "Transportation Fee Program Study" should be "City of Angels Traffic Mitigation Fee Program Update". 2nd paragraph, "City Council wave" should be "City Council waive". 3rd paragraph, "right to wave" should be "right to waive".

Page 7, 1st paragraph, 3rd line down, "revenue is down" should be "revenue is probably down". 5th line down, "When the reservations" should be "Generally when the reservations". 6th line down, "there isn't enough" should be "there aren't enough". 8th line down, "that our paying" should be "that are paying".

Page 7, 2nd paragraph, last line, "them do a business" should be "them apply for a business".

Page 7, 6th paragraph, "committee's recommendation is" should be "committee's recommendation on this issue".

Page 7, 11th paragraph, "The Planning Commission is in agreement" should be "The Planning Commission with the exception of the chair is in agreement".

Page 8, Item 9, 3rd line down, "to market the study" should be "to market the Buxton Study".

Page 8, Item 9, 3rd line down, "They have talked" should be "Other groups have talked".
Page 8, Item 10, "would like to back" should be "would like to be back".

**MOTION BY COMMISSIONER REESMAN AND DULY SECONDED BY
COMMISSIONER ROWE AND CARRIED 3-0 TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 8, 2010
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES AS AMENDED.**

VERIFICATION OF RESOLUTIONS

2. Verification of Resolution 2010-19, a Resolution of the City of Angels Planning Commission recommending to the City of Angels City Council to approve Amendment to Title 17, Chapter 12, Zoning Districts.

Commissioner Rowe no comment.

Commissioner Reesman no comment.

Chair Croletto stated that under the last paragraph, 3rd line down, "to be rezone" should be "to be rezoned".

PUBLIC COMMENTS

OPENED 6:25 P.M.

CLOSED 6:26 P.M.

COMMUNICATIONS AND PETITIONS

None

PUBLIC HEARING

3. Resolution 2011-02 Landscape Title 17.63 and Oak Tree Preservation Title 17.64.

Planning Director Hanham stated that we have done everything that we were suppose to do but the first item on the list and that was to adopt a Resolution of Intent to amend the ordinance. So we need to do a Resolution of Intent first, before we can hear this public hearing. Staff recommends that the Commission continues this item to the next meeting so that we can adopt the Resolution of Intent before Resolution 2011-02 is adopted.

The discussion that followed was what day and time could the commission meet for a special meeting to continue this item and do a Resolution of Intent. The commission concurred that a special meeting on January 18th at the Fire Station at 8:00am would be the best choice. At this time the commission would like to make the following changes to Title 17.63 and Title 17.64.

In the staff report please have all Ordinances that we looked at including Auburn, Rocklin, Roseville and San Mateo County.

On Resolution 2011-02, in the title, "Chapter 17.64 Oak Tree Guidelines" should be "Chapter 17.64 Oak Tree and Heritage Trees Guidelines". 2nd Whereas, delete "Comprehensive" and "Update". 3rd Whereas "Resolution 2011" should be "Resolution 2011-01" and then "Suburban Commercial" should be "Landscaping and the addition of Title 17, Chapter 64, Oak Tree and Heritage Trees Preservation".

Title 17.63

Page 5, 2nd paragraph, 3rd line down, "livestock, grazing" should be "livestock grazing".

Page 5, 5th paragraph, 2nd line down, "Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance" should be "OHT". 3rd line down "defined as a tree" should be "defined as an oak tree".

Title 17.64

In the title, "Oak Tree Preservation" should be "Oak Tree and Heritage Trees Preservation (OHT)".

Page 1, 1st paragraph, "Oak Tree Preservation" should be "OHT".

Page 8, 17.64.100, in the title "Oak Tree Preservation Guidelines" should be "Oak Tree and Heritage Trees Preservation Guidelines (OHT)".

Page 8, 17.64.100, A, after it states City of Angels, delete Oak & Heritage Tree Preservation Guidelines, and add "OHT".

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER REESMAN AND DULY SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ROWE AND CARRIED 3-0 TO CONTINUE THIS ITEM TO A SPECIAL MEETING TO BE HELD ON TUESDAY, JANUARY 18th, 2011 AT 8:00 A.M. AT THE FIRE HOUSE FOR A RESOLUTION OF INTENT TO AMEND TITLE 17.63 LANDSCAPING AND TO ADD TITLE 17.64 OAK TREE AND HERITAGE TREES PRESERVATION.

4. Resolution 2010-20 Transportation Fee Program.

Planning Director Hanham presented the staff report and Resolution 2010-20 a resolution of the City of Angels Planning Commission Recommending to the City Council the approval of the Transportation Mitigation Fee Study dated November 2010.

The discussion that followed was concerning the different concerns from Chair Croletto's memo and the reasoning that Fehr & Peers used. Chair Croletto's biggest concern is with the growth rate and the number of new jobs created each year because all of those numbers affect the amount of the fee.

Commissioner Reesman questioned if the number of jobs created each year could be due to jobs outside of the City but the traffic still has to go through the City to get from work to home.

Planning Director Hanham stated that those numbers include any jobs in the Sphere of Influence, it doesn't include the people traveling from Arnold to the Valley.

Chair Croletto stated that what should be used is the middle, such as, our growth is between 1.8% and 2.25% and so a better number to use could be 2.16%. I would like to know what the difference is between what the consultant has it at now and the 2.16% growth rate.

Commissioner Rowe asked if we approve this resolution and it goes to City Council, what change in the fee will this make to someone that is building a house.

Chair Croletto stated the fee will go up \$743.00.

Commissioner Reesman stated that the City of Angels fee for traffic mitigation is about half of other jurisdictions.

Planning Director Hanham stated that the consultant gets his numbers and estimates from the Regional Transportation Program. So I am recommending that the Commission adopt this resolution because it is consistent with our General Plan.

Chair Croletto stated that the title of the Resolution 2010-20 should say “A resolution of the City of Angels Planning Commission recommending to the City Council the approval of the City of Angels Camp Traffic Mitigation Fee Program Update”.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER REESMAN AND DULY SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ROWE AND CARRIED 2-1 WITH CHAIR CROLETTA VOTING NO TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 2010-20 A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF ANGELS PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDING TO THE CITY COUNCIL THE APPROVAL OF THE CITY OF ANGELS CAMP TRAFFIC MITIGATION FEE PROGRAM UPDATE AS AMENDED.

PLANNING COMMISSION MATTERS

None

COMMITTEE REPORTS

5. Joint City Council/Planning Commission Workshops – Chairman Croletto.

Chair Croletto stated that there is nothing new to report at this time.

6. Infrastructure Committee – Chairman Croletto

Chair Croletto reported that the items discussed were the improvement standards, a 2nd water line through town, Ron Davis easement in Angel Oaks, water plant projects, wastewater projects, scrubber, Traffic Mitigation Fee, Sphere of Influence, Prop 1B funds, new residential sprinkler requirements, and water rate structure change.

7. Traffic Circulation Committee- Commissioner Griffin

Planning Director Hanham reported that the committee discussed the circulation guidelines, and off-street parking standards.

8. General Plan Implementation-Commissioner Rowe

Commissioner Rowe reported there is nothing new to report. A meeting was set for January 25th, 2011 at 9:00 am at the Community Development Department.

9. BLT-Commissioner Rowe

Commissioner Rowe reported that the BLT spent a long time talking about making the January 20th meeting very effective. She needs to speak with staff about the Angels Creek Master Trail Plan. The pole banners are still in the process of being made. She would like encourage people to attend.

COMMISSIONER'S REPORTS

10. Action List-Chair Croletto

Commissioner Rowe wanted to know when the Large Format Retail was going to be at City Council again.

Planning Director Hanham stated that it will be going back to City Council for them to look at with the 80,000 square feet on 2/1/2011.

Commissioner Rowe questioned what can be done to show support for the Ordinance.

Planning Director Hanham stated that at the last meeting a lot of people showed their support of the 80,000 square feet. If you want to get up and talk about your support you can do that.

Chair Croletto stated that he would like to get the Library a copy of the 2020 General Plan, the EIR, and a Land Use Map because what the Library has is outdated.
Chair Croletto passed out the action list dated 1/13/2011. (see attachment 1)

STAFF REPORTS

Planning Director Hanham reported that plans for Mark Twain's Clinic on Stanislaus Ave. should be on it's way soon, the JPA was approved by the County, and the Sphere of Influence will be on LAFCO in February.

MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 8:24PM.



Gary Croletto, Chairman

ATTEST:



Jennifer Preston, Deputy City Clerk

Attachment 1

**City of Angels Planning Commission Action List
1/13/2011**

[illegible]

Comments on City of Angels Camp Traffic Mitigation Fee Program Update “Final Report” dated September 2009-October 2010

Page 1 - ■ See page 15 comments below.

Page 3 - ■ Why isn't the General Plan that was adopted on 2/3/09 being used in a report dated 9/09?
■ Using a “annual (page 5 & 13) growth rate assumption” of 2.52% for the next 20 years is a poor assumption and forecast in the current and predictable, near future economy.

Page 5 - ■ Why is the secondary sphere of influence included which doesn't exist anymore and would be the in County's plan.
■ The posted speed limit of SR 49 is 45 mph west of Dogtown Road and 35 mph down to 25 mph to the east.
■ The posted speed limit on SR 4 is 45 mph east and west of Angels Camp.
■ Angels Camp SR 4 Bypass is currently complete, *not* under construction.

Page 9 - ■ General Plan Final EIR

Page 13 - ■ Items under “reasonable potential”:
Sierra Avenue Connection was strongly rejected by the residents of the “annex/old town” neighborhood at the public hearings on the General Plan and don't want traffic going through the old narrow “legacy” streets in their neighborhood.
Demarest Street Extension was strongly rejected by the residents who own the property currently making up the gated existing gravel roadway.

Page 14 - ■ Why isn't the long range forecast of a “Southeast Bypass” mentioned in the Report in the same manner the SR 49 Bypass (Alternate 3B) is referenced. These are both important to future Traffic Mitigation Reports in which this Report will be used as a reference.

Page 15 - ■ How were the Retail, Service, and Other Employment “Job” figures arrived at in both the Base Year and the Future Year Amounts? They seem to be unrealistic forecasts....an additional 1,860 jobs or 98 jobs per year for 19 years?

Page 20 - ■ ~~“or a roundabout at SR 4 (N) / Angels Oaks Drive”~~ The residents of Angel Oaks and Greenhorn Creek were, and are absolutely against a roundabout at that location.
■ The residents of the City of Angels completely rejected the concept of a roundabout at SR 49/ SR 4 (S). It is also physically impossible without destroying a large area of the Historical District and much needed parking spaces.
■ Was any thought given by the consultant doing this report to the physical constraints, commercial property acquisition, and topography of widening this stretch of SR 49 from two lanes to four lanes? It would also require 4 lanes to merge into two lanes at an “F” LOS intersection (Dogtown Road) as noted in their own report! Was any consideration given to this concept regarding the traffic count when the high school lets out at ±3:30 PM....the traffic count was taken in March 2009 according to the report, page 10.

Was *Appendix F: Land Use Summary By TAZ* checked for accuracy and current & correct Land Uses by City Planning Staff?

Based on this report as written, the current Traffic Impact fee per DUE of \$ 4,244 will increase to \$ 4,957, an increase of \$ 713.00.

Gary Croletto,
18 February 2010 *Revised 12/8/10*